(44)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR
WRIT PETITION NO. 513 of 2002

Petitioner — Narad Singh Rajput, aged about 42 years, S/o Gambhir Singh Rajput, resident of village Kokhabod, Patwari Halka No. 30, Tehsil Saja, District Durg (Chhattisgarh)

Versus

Respondents

1. State of Chhattisgarh through the Department of Revenue, D.K.S. Building, Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
2. Additional Collector, Bemetara, District Durg (Chhattisgarh)
3. Sub Divisional Officer (Revenue), Saja, District Durg (Chhattisgarh)
4. Tehsildar, Saja, District Durg (Chhattisgarh)
5. Nand Kumar Rajput, S/o Dashrath Singh Rajput
6. Gyani Singh Rajput, S/o Dhurandhar Singh Rajput
7. Kumar Singh Rajput, S/o Lakhan Singh Rajput
8. Sanju Rawat, S/o Samaru Rawat.
9. Vishnu, S/o Khedu Rawat
10. Tope Singh, S/o Bharat Singh
11. Daulat Singh, S/o Tope Singh
12. Nagendra Singh Rajput, S/o Kamta Singh Rajput

No. 5 to 12 are residents of village Kohkabod, Tehsil Saja, District Durg (Chhattisgarh)

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

Single Bench :- Hon'ble Shri Justice Satish K. Agnihotri

Present :- Mr. B.D. Guru, Advocate for the petitioner.
Miss Deepali Pandey, Panel lawyer for the respondents/State.

ORDER
(Passed on this 18th day of July, 2007)

1. The petitioner, who is a resident of village Kokhabod, Patwari Halka No. 30, Tehsil Saja, District Durg, claims to be vitally interested in the matter as a private respondents No. 5 to 12 are

(45)

indulging into the construction of temple on part of Khasra No. 206 in village Kokhabod.

2. The petitioner, by this petition, seeks a writ of certiorari questioning the settlement of land in favour of the respondents No. 5 to 12 by the Tahsildar under the provisions of the Madhya Pradesh Land Revenue Code, 1959 (hereinafter referred to as "the Code, 1959")

3. Be that as it may, the dispute involved in the present petition is in the nature of land disputes which can be dealt with under the provisions of the Code, 1959. If the petitioner has any grievance against the order passed by the Tahsildar or by the Additional Collector, he may very well approach the superior tribunal i.e. Board of Revenue.

4. The petitioner has not established semblance of any right or breach thereof, invoking extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution, thus, there is no merit in the case.

5. The writ petition is accordingly dismissed summarily.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge